10L, 20. 2005; 20549345501-02700-MHPUTCHOCUMEn455437861 07/20/2005

10 9673308 1 8/19204

FILED

JUL 2 6 2005

HIGHARD W. WIEKING GLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT Bingham McCutchen LLP 1 DAVID M. BALABANIAN (SBN 37368) CHRISTOPHER B. HOCKETT (SBN 121539) NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA JOY K. FUYUNO (SBN 193890) 3 Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4067 Telephone: (415) 393-2000 Facsimile: (415) 393-2286 Attorneys for Defendant Intel Corporation 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 BAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 10 . 11 No. C-05-2700 RONALD KONIECZKA, individually and on 12 behalf of all others similarly situated, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] 13 ORDER TO CONTINUE FILING DATE Plaintiff. FOR DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO 14 ٧, PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware 15 corporation, 16 Defendant. 17 18 IT IS STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THROUGH THEIR 19 COUNSEL AS FOLLOWS: 20 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2, Plaintiff Ronald Konieczka and Defendant Intel 21 Corporation hereby stipulate that Intel Corporation's response to Plaintiff's complaint shall be 22 due either 60 days after transfer of the above captioned case pursuant to any motion to coordinate 23 or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section 1407 or, in the alternative, 45 days 24 after any such motion has been denied. The parties request this transfer because the plaintiffs in 25 Brauch, et al. v. Intel Corp., No. C 05-2743 (BZ) (N.D. Cal., filed July 5, 2005), a related matter, 26

1	have filed a petition to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section		
2	1407, and the above-styled action has been identified as a related action to that petition. As a		
3	result the outcome of the pending petition will impact significantly the schedule of this case.		
4	This is the first stipulation between the parties. Because this litigation has just		
5	begun, granting such a stipulation will not have any negative impact on the schedule of this case.		
6	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED. DATED: July / 7, 2005		
7			
8	Bingham McCutchen LLP		
9			
10	By: Austras		
11	// (/ // JOY K, FUYUNO		
12	Attorneys for Defendant Intel Corporation		
13			
14			
15	Law Offices of Jeffrey F. Keller		
16			
17	By:		
18	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
19	Ronald Konieczka		
20			
21			
22	·		
23			
24			
25			
26			
	. 2		

JUL. 20. 2005 Case 3.65000 MAP Document 15543F864 07/20/2005 Page 23.00 10/194

	PROPOSEDI ORDER TO CONTINUE DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE DATE		
2	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Lotel Corporation's response to		
3	Plaintiff's complaint shall be due either 60 days after transfer of the above captioned case		
4	pursuant to any motion to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section		
5	1407, or, in the alternative, 45 days after any such motion has been denied.		
6	pursuant to stipulation, it is so ordered.		
7	Dated: July 22, 2005		
8	11 State		
9	Henorate Marilyn Hall Pate	1	
Û	United States District Judge		
1			
2	•		
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	, ·		
9			
10 1-1	•		
!1 !Z	·		
 .3	·		
	·		
14 15			
16			
-~	_		

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE RESPONSE DATE

1

BF/21627225.1